

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-15 are rejected. Claims 7-9, 11 and 13 have been amended. Claims 6 and 10 have been canceled. New claims 16-20 have been added. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shurts (U.S. Patent 5,572,673, cited by Applicant) and Edwards (EPO 0926605A1, cited by Applicant). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites attempting access of a first networked entity having a first preselected security level by a search engine having a second preselected security level and allowing access of the network entity by the search engine if the second security level is equal or higher than the first security level. Shurts does not teach or suggest a search engine, as recited in claim 1. As defined in the Specification of the present application, a search engine can catalog and index the contents of a Web server. (See Spec., Page 13, Lines 5-6). Shurts discloses a flexible database management system having security for database objects (See Shurts, Col. 2, Lines 35-36). In contrast to the contention of the Office Action, the database management system (or database kernel, as it is referred to in the Office Action) that stores objects disclosed in Shurts does not correspond to a search engine, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the database management system disclosed in Shurts does not catalog and index the contents of a Web server like a search engine, as disclosed in the present application.

Shurts does not teach or suggest a search engine having a preselected security level, as recited in claim 1. The database management system disclosed in Shurts includes sensitivity labels for different objects (See Shurts, Col. 3, Lines 42-50). Consequently, in the event of a security breach of the database management system disclosed in Shurts, an unauthorized agent could possibly compromise the objects within the database management system.

Claim 1 further recites attempting access to the search engine having a second preselected security level by a user having a third preselected security level and allowing access to the search engine by the user upon the third preselected security level being equal to or higher than the second security level. Accordingly, Shurts does not teach or suggest attempting or allowing access of a user having a third preselected security level that is at or higher than a second preselected security level of a search engine. Accordingly, Shurts does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 1.

The addition of Edwards does not cure the deficiencies of Shurts. Edwards teaches a browser system wherein mobile code is processed in a secure environment, so a client remains relatively safe from attack (See Edwards, Par. [0014]). Edwards does not teach or suggest a search engine having a preselected security level, as recited in claim 1. In fact, Edwards is silent on employment of a search engine. Therefore, Edwards does not teach or suggest attempting and allowing access of a first networked entity having a first preselected security level by a search engine having a second preselected security level, or allowing access by a user having a third preselected security level to the search engine upon the third preselected security level being equal to or higher than the second security level, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, taken individually or in combination, Shurts and Edwards do not teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 1.

Claim 2-5 and 7-9 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and should be patentable for substantially the same reasons as claim 1 and for the specific elements recited therein. Accordingly, allowance of claims 2-5 and 7-9 is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 recites a search engine presenting a digital signature certificate in attempting access of a first networked entity. In contrast to the contention of the Office Action, a search engine presenting a digital signature certificate in attempting access of a first networked entity, as recited in claim 2, is not well known in the art. The Office Action provides no reference that teaches or suggests such claimed element. Further, Shurts and Edwards are both silent on the use of a digital signature certificate. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 1. As stated above with respect to claim 1, neither Shurts nor Edwards taken individually or in combination teach or suggest a search engine having a preselected security level. Consequently, neither Shurts nor Edwards teaches or suggests a plurality of search engines having respective preselected security level, as recited in claim 8. Accordingly, neither Shurts nor Edwards teaches or suggests attempting access, by a plurality of search engines having an associated preselected security level, to a plurality of networked entities each having an associated preselected security level, and allowing access to networked entities by search engines having a security level equal to or higher than a respective networked entity, as recited in claim 8.

Claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 8, and should be patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 8. Claim 9 recites allowing access by a user to search engines having a security level equal to or below the user. In Shurts, the database management system limits access to objects by employing sensitivity labels. If a subject's sensitivity label dominates an object's sensitivity label, that subject can employ the object (See Shurts, Col. 3, Lines 43-50). Accordingly, a subject can access the database management system when the subject's sensitivity labels do not dominate all of the sensitivity labels of the objects within the database management system. Conversely, the search engines recited in claim 9 allow access by a user, if a respective search engine has a preselected security level at or below the preselected security level of the user.

Claim 11 recites a first networked entity having a first preselected security level, and a search engine having a second preselected security level, wherein the first networked entity allows access by the search engine upon the second security level being equal to or higher than the first security level. Claim 11 further recites that the search engine allows access by a user having a third preselected security level upon the third preselected security level being equal to or higher than the second security level. As stated above with respect to claim 1, Shurts in view of Edwards do not teach or suggest a network entity that allows access by a search engine having a preselected security level that is at or above the security level of the network entity, or a search engine that allows access by a user having a preselected security level that is at or above the

security level of the search engine. Accordingly, Shurts does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 11.

Claims 12-15 depend directly or indirectly from claim 11 and should be patentable for substantially the same reasons as claim 11 and for the specific elements recited therein.

Accordingly, allowance of claims 12-15 is respectfully requested.

Claim 12 recites a digital certificate that is presented to a first networked entity upon a search engine attempting access of the first networked entity. Neither Shurts nor Edwards alone or in combinations teach or suggest presenting a digital certificate to a first network entity upon a search engine attempting access of the first networked entity. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is patentable over the cited prior art.

For the reasons described above, claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-15 should be patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. New Claims 16-20

New claim 16 depends from claim 11 and further recites a plurality of search engines each having a preselected security level, wherein each search engine of the plurality of search engines is allowed access to networked entities, of a plurality of networked entities, that have a security level at or below the security level of the respective search engine. None of the cited references teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 16. Accordingly, claim 16 should be patentable over the cited art.

New claim 17 depends from claim 16 and further recites that a user is allowed to access search engines having a security level at or below the security level of the user. None of the cited references teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 16. Accordingly, claim 17 should be patentable over the cited art.

New claim 18 recites a plurality of networked entities, each having a preselected security level, a plurality of search engines each having a preselected security level, wherein each search engine of the plurality of search engines is allowed access to networked entities having a security level at or below the security level of the respective search engine, wherein a user having a

preselected security level is allowed access to search engines having a security level at or below the security level of the user. None of the cited references teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 18. Accordingly, claim 18 should be patentable over the cited art.

New claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18 and should be patentable for substantially the same reasons as claim 18 and for the specific elements recited therein. New claim 19 recites a digital signature certificate which is presented to a networked entity upon a search engine attempting to access a networked entity. None of the cited references teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 19. Accordingly, claim 19 and 20 should be patentable over the cited art.

For the reasons described above, claims 16-20 should be patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, allowance of claims 16-20 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 12/21/07



Christopher P. Harris
Registration No. 43,660

CUSTOMER No.: 26,294

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, & TUMMINO L.L.P.
526 SUPERIOR AVENUE, SUITE 1111
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114-1400
Phone: (216) 621-2234
Fax: (216) 621-4072